

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
COLUMBIA DIVISION**

CURTIS DANIEL HART,

Plaintiff,

v.

FRANK STRADA,

Defendant.

)
)
)
)
) **No. 1:23-cv-00009**
)
)
)
)

ORDER


On August 18, 2025, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) (Doc. No. 68) in this prisoner civil rights case recommending that the Court grant Frank Strada’s motion for summary judgment (Doc. No. 50). The Magistrate Judge warned Curtis Hart, proceeding pro se, that any objections to the R&R “must be filed within fourteen (14) days of service.” (Doc. No. 68 at 22); see also Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(d) (providing that where service is by mail, the potential objecting party has seventeen days to file timely objections to an R&R). Despite these specific warnings regarding waiver, however, Hart did not file any timely objections to the R&R. See Stilson v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec. Admin., 2025 WL 2459603, at *1 (N.D. Ohio Aug. 27, 2025) (collecting cases holding that “[i]n the Sixth Circuit, failure to object constitutes a forfeiture”).

Where, as here, there are no “timely objection[s]” to the R&R, “the court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note to 1983 amendment (citations omitted). Having carefully reviewed the R&R, including its legal analysis and recitation of the factual record, the Court finds no clear error and agrees with the Magistrate Judge’s recommendation. Specifically,

the Court agrees that Hart's § 1983 Fourteenth Amendment equal protection claim fails because he did not present evidence showing "how his lack of access to an electronic tablet [in prison] in any way infringes upon a protected constitutional right that would entitle him to relief." (Doc. No. 68 at 8–9).

Accordingly, the R&R (Doc. No. 68) is **APPROVED AND ADOPTED**; and Strada's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. No. 50) is **GRANTED**. This is a final order. The Clerk of the Court shall enter a final judgment in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 58 and close this file.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



WAVERLY D. CRENSHAW, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE